

REMARKS

Claims 1, 16, 23 and 24 are amended herein. Claims 2, 15 and 21 are canceled herein. Claims 1, 3-14, 16-20 and 22-25 now remain pending in the application.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider earlier rejections in light of the following remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 over Janow

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,061,570 to Janow ("Janow"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-15 recite a controller to activate an auto dialing calling module to send a notification message to a user upon satisfaction of a particular event based on Caller ID information, wherein the satisfaction of the particular event is determined based on a comparison of one or more entries in the table to Caller ID information contained in a log. Claims 16-23 recite a method and apparatus for logging a plurality of entries of Caller ID information as it is received by a voice messaging system, and reviewing the entries of logged Caller ID information for satisfaction of a predetermined event by one or more of the incoming calls based on the logged Caller ID information. Claims 24 and 25 recite a calling module activated by receipt of predetermined Caller ID information, the calling module being adapted to initiate a telephone call to a predetermined notification telephone number upon satisfaction of a predetermined event based on received Caller ID information.

Janow teaches a unified message announcing system that causes a paging service to be contacted. (Janow, See, e.g., Abstract, and col. 2, lines 24-29) The undersigned has reviewed the entire text of Janow, and finds little information about what actually causes the page to be sent. What little information there is in Janow, it all relates to the content of a message itself, **NOT** to Caller ID information.

For instance, at col. 2, lines 33-36, Janow explains that “whenever **messages** arrive at the platforms that subscriber 23 wishes to know about” (emphasis added), that the paging system 20 is contacted. In the following paragraph, Janow explains that “the **message** is analyzed in block 101 to determine whether paging alert criteria have been met. The criteria may relate to the identity of the sender, to an urgency code in the message, time of day, etc.” (emphasis added)

Clearly, at best, Janow discloses analysis of a message to determine whether or not paging criteria have been met. Janow fails to disclose use of Caller ID information to determine paging criteria, as recited by all claims of the present application.

Moreover, claims 16-23 recite action based on a macro view of a number of calls, not just on the content of a single call. In particular, claims 16-23 recite logging a **plurality** of entries of Caller ID information as it is received by a voice messaging system, and reviewing the **plurality** of entries of logged Caller ID information for satisfaction of a predetermined event based on the logged Caller ID information. This is a macro view based on an event built from more than one message. For instance, after 10 messages have been received.

Janow is focused on the content of a single message. In particular, Janow discloses analysis of a single message in Fig. 2, block 101, with associated brief description at col. 2, lines 45-48.

Janow fails to disclose logging and review of a **plurality** of Caller ID information for determination of a paging notification, as recited by claims 16-22.

A benefit of Applicants' logging of Caller ID information and sending messages based on Caller ID information is, e.g., greater accuracy. The cited prior art relies on analysis of a message for a determination if a predetermined criteria has been met to send a page. Analysis of a message requires a relatively sophisticated system to be able to distinguish a desired telephone number from other telephone numbers that are possible left by a user, if a telephone number has been left at all. Applicants' invention utilizes Caller ID information that can not be confused with any other telephone numbers that can

be part of a message and is automatically supplied if such a service is subscribed to. The prior art fails to disclose or suggest such a benefit.

The Office Action alleges that Janow discloses Caller ID at col. 2, lines 45-48 (Office Action Response to Arguments, page 8). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Janow discloses examination of a message for a determination the identity of a caller. However, Caller ID, a term of art, is a subscription service provided by a telephone company that does not relay on any type of analysis of a message for a determination of a caller's identity. Caller ID information is sent to a telephony device irregardless if a message is left by a caller.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 1-25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df